



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,615	12/30/2003	Daniel F. Justin	13447.41	8943
7590 01/05/2009				
DANA L. TANGREN WORKMAN NYDEGGER 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER				
RAMANA, ANURADHA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3775				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/05/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/750,615

**Applicant(s)**

JUSTIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Anu Ramana

**Art Unit**

3775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32, 33 and 35-50 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☒ Claim(s) 50 is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 32, 33 and 35-49 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/30/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/12/07.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 32-33, 35-36, 44-46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 32, the recitation "so that the rasp body can reciprocate relative to the rasp guide" is deemed to be new matter. Since the rasp guide is received within an opening of the rasp body, the rasp guide is stationary with respect to the rasp body.

In claim 49, the recitation "and past the bottom surface of the rasp body" is deemed to be new matter. Applicant's disclosure, as originally filed, shows the rasp guide to be received within an opening in the rasp body such that the guide is flush with the bottom surface of the rasp body.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 32-33, 35-36 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 32, the recitation "so that the rasp body can reciprocate relative to the rasp guide" renders the claim vague and indefinite since the functional recitation is not supported by recitation of adequate structure in the claim. The rasp guide is received within a slot of the rasp body so it is unclear how the rasp body can reciprocate relative

to the rasp guide, since the rasp body and guide would move together. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 32 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Michelson (US 6,159,214)

Michelson discloses a system for resecting bone including: a rasp body or plate 809 having a bottom surface with a plurality of cutting edges; a milling block or rasp guide 800; and an elongated retention rod 140 with a connector 138 removably connected to the rasp guide (Figs. 13 and 59-61, col. 20, lines 18-67 and col. 21, lines 1-13).

It is noted that, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claims 32-33, 35, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamada (US 6,436,101).

Hamada discloses a device for resecting bone including: an implant or "rasp body" 210 that is plate-like and has a surface with a plurality of cutting edges; a rasp guide 412 with a pin 421 extending between spaced apart forks (defined by 423 and 435); and an elongated retention rod 403 having a connector 427 to removably couple with the rasp guide (Fig. 33, col. 24, lines 37-67 and col. 25, lines 1-14).

It is noted that, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claims 37-43, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen et al. (US 5,356,414).

Regarding claims 37-41, Cohen et al. disclose a system including: a baseplate or "first resecting template" 94, the template having a plurality of discrete guide spaces 120; a retention rod 152 adapted to fit within a tunnel formed on the tibia; a means for removably attaching (tower guide 110) the retention rod to the top surface of the template; and a second resecting template or drill bushing 104 (Figs. 6 and 8, col. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-37).

Regarding claim 48, Cohen et al. disclose a system for resecting a proximal portion of a tibia including: a rasp body 138 with a bottom surface having a plurality of cutting edges; a tower or rasp guide 110, the rasp body being slidable relative to the rasp guide; and an elongated retention rod 150 removably coupled to the rasp guide (Figs. 8, 10, 12 and 14, col. 3, lines 52-68, cols. 4-6 and col. 7, lines 1-39).

With regard to being "adapted for," it has been held that the recitation that an element is adapted to perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform and does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. In re Hutchison, 69 USPQ 138.

Further, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claims 32-33 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Masse et al. (US 4,739,750).

Masse et al. disclose a tool assembly or system for resecting bone including: a rasp body 4; a rasp guide ( 3, 50) wherein at least a portion of the guide, i.e., peg 50 projects through an opening in the rasp body such that it projects beyond the bottom surface of the rasp body, the peg being slidable or capable of being slid relative to the rasp guide; and a handle 1 or elongated retention rod removably coupled to the rasp guide by means of a screw 7 (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 23-68 and col. 3, lines 1-48).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 50 is allowed.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anu Ramana whose telephone number is (571) 272-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR  
January 3, 2009

/Anu Ramana/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3775